

**UNPUBLISHED**

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS**

**FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
Plaintiff-Appellee.

v.

No. 98-4836

DON ROSEBOROUGH, a/k/a Dirt,  
Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the District of South Carolina, at Columbia.  
Dennis W. Shedd, District Judge.  
(CR-98-125)

Submitted: December 7, 1999

Decided: January 12, 2000

Before WILKINS, LUTTIG, and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

**COUNSEL**

Langdon D. Long, Assistant Federal Public Defender, Columbia,  
South Carolina, for Appellant. Jane Barrett Taylor, OFFICE OF THE  
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Columbia, South Carolina, for  
Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See  
Local Rule 36(c).

## OPINION

### PER CURIAM:

Don Roseborough appeals his conviction and sentence after a guilty plea to conspiracy to possess with intent to distribute and to distribute cocaine base in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 846 (1994), possession with intent to distribute and distribution of cocaine base in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 841 (1994), and aiding and abetting in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2 (1994). Roseborough's attorney has filed a brief in accordance with Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), raising two issues but stating that, in his view, there are no meritorious grounds for appeal. Roseborough has filed a pro se supplemental brief raising one sentencing issue. Finding no reversible error, we affirm.

Roseborough's counsel first questions whether the district court complied with the requirements of Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure when taking Roseborough's plea. Following a de novo review of the entire record, we conclude that the district court complied with all the mandates of Rule 11 in accepting Roseborough's guilty plea. See Fed. R. Crim. P. 11; United States v. Goins, 51 F.3d 400, 402 (4th Cir. 1995) (providing standard).

Next, counsel raises the issue of whether Roseborough's sentence was properly calculated. In his pro se supplemental brief, Roseborough also challenges the district court's calculation of his sentence. Specifically, Roseborough contends that the court erred in awarding two points to his criminal history score under U.S. Sentencing Guidelines Manual § 4A1.1(e) (1997). We have considered Roseborough's claim and find it meritless. We find no plain error in the calculation of Roseborough's sentence because it was properly computed under the Sentencing Guidelines.

As required by Anders, we have examined the entire record and find no other meritorious issues for appeal. Accordingly, we affirm Roseborough's conviction and sentence. This court requires that counsel inform his client, in writing, of his right to petition the Supreme Court of the United States for further review. If the client requests that a petition be filed, but counsel believes that such a petition would be frivolous, then counsel may move in this court for leave

to withdraw from representation. Counsel's motion must state that a copy thereof was served on the client. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED